1	Q. Okay. Do you recall asking
. 2	Mr. Minnifield, going back to that same incident,
3	about a particular bathroom door inside of the
4	house?
5	A. Yes, sir.
6	Q. And did Mr. Minnifield tell you or give
7	you any indication that he had gained access to
8	that bathroom door or the bathroom?
. 9	A. Yes, sir. He told me that he kicked the
10	door in.
11	Q. Did he tell you how he gained access to
12	the residence?
13	A. He kicked or knocked that door in as
14	well.
15	Q. So he told you that he kicked both doors
16	in?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Did Mr. Minnifield ever give you any
19	indication, referring to the hatchet and the
2 0	butcher knife that he had with him, what he would
21	have done or what his intentions were with those
22	items having those items?
23	A. Yes, sir. He said something to the
24	effect, had he caught her, he would have harmed her
2.5	or done something to her.

- Q. Okay. Did he specifically tell you that he would have used either one of those items on her?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Did -- during the course of this conversation with Mr. Minnifield, did he also indicate to you whether or not he had ever tampered with Mrs. Minnifield's car?
- A. Yes, sir, he did. As a matter of fact, I questioned him about tampering with her vehicle.

 On one particular occasion, it was during the night, and he made the comment, something to the effect, not that night. And I asked him when had he tampered with her vehicle. And he mentioned he had tampered with her vehicle during the daylight hours on some other occasion.
- Q. Okay. Do you know if they were any -I'll withdraw that question. Do you remember
 asking Mr. Minnifield a question about his
 truthfulness? And, I guess, specifically, do you
 remember asking Mr. Minnifield anything about
 whether or not he would lie?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And do you remember what his response was?

- A. I believe he told me that he would.
- Q. If I could --

1.3

- A. Well, he was depending on what the circumstances were, especially involving this particular case because that's what we were talking about.
- Q. So, if I understand you correctly, did you say that he said he would lie depending on the situation that he was in?
- A. Yes, sir. I was asking him questions about witnesses that he stated were lying for Mrs. Minnifield. And I asked him if his witnesses would lie for him, which he stated that they probably would. And I asked him if he would lie to save his own neck, and he made some comment about the circumstances involving this case. And I informed him that he could get prison time for the stalking charge. And he more or less indicated that he would.
 - Q. Would lie?
 - A. Yes, sir.

MR. BAILEY: Your Honor, I think that's -- I believe that's all the questions that I want to ask Detective Williams at this time. And just for time's sake, I believe, the defense has

1	already stipulated that the defendant's statement
2	would be entered into evidence; is that correct,
3	Mr. Minnifield?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Sure.
5	THE COURT: Again, the parties, in
6	order to save time this morning, have stipulated
7	that his taped statement will be admitted into
8	evidence, and it's to go back with you to the
9	deliberation room and can be played by you. And if
10	you need any assistance with the tape, we can help
11	you with it. But it is evidence in the case, and I
12	am going to admit it.
13	MR. BAILEY: So at this time, we
14	would offer it's State's Exhibit No. 4, for the
15	record.
16	THE COURT: Okay. And it's
17	admitted.
18	(State's Exhibit No. 4 was admitted
19	into evidence.)
20	MR. BAILEY: Now, I do need to ask
21	Detective Williams just a couple questions about
22	the tape.
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION (continued)
24	BY MR. BAILEY:
25	Q. During the course of taping this
1	

1 statement, you had some problems with the tape? 2 Yes, sir, the first tape. During questioning, the tape just clicked, turned off for 3 some reason, and I rewinded it and noticed that the 4 voice was distorted on there, so we had to get a 5 second tape. 6 Okay. And did you start back over with 7 your questioning on the second tape? 8 9 Yes, sir, I did. Α. And are both of those tapes that you've 10 referred to, are both of those contained in what's 11 been labeled as State's Exhibit No. 4? 12 13 A. Yes, sir. 14 Q. Okay. 15 THE COURT: Is there any way you can distinguish which is the first or second tape? 16 17 THE WITNESS: I believe I have the 18 tapes marked. 19 MR. BAILEY: They're labeled. 20 I believe that's all the questions I have for 21 Detective Williams. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Do you have 23 anything for her? 24 THE DEFENDANT: No. 25 THE COURT: Okay. You can step

```
1
        down.
 2
                      (Witness excused.)
 3
                       THE COURT: And at this time, does
 4
       the State rest?
 5
                       MR. BAILEY: State rests.
 6
                       THE COURT: Both sides have rested;
 7
       and we're going to take a break for lunch.
       going to let you go to one o'clock. And if you
 8
       will report back to the jury assembly room at that
 9
       time, then there will be closing arguments, and
10
       I'll instruct you on the law. But you're excused
11
       until one o'clock. Will that give everybody enough
12
13
       time? I think it will.
14
                       (Out of the presence of the jury.)
15
                      THE COURT: Mr. Bailey, I'm going to
       ask if you'll be sure that the court reporter knows
16
17
       how to work the tape, so if they do want to hear
       it --
18
19
                      MR. BAILEY: Okay.
20
                      THE COURT:
                                  And they may be able to.
21
       But if they aren't, we can assist them.
22
                      MR. BAILEY: Okav.
23
                      THE COURT: At this time,
       Mr. Minnifield, do you, again, renew your motions?
24
25
                      THE DEFENDANT: Right.
```

```
1
                       THE COURT: And I'm going to deny
  2
        them.
             Again, I'm going to just charge straight out
  3
        of the pattern book on stalking. And I think it
  4
        really covers everything.
  5
 6
                       MR. BAILEY: Judge, I have one
       requested charge I would like the Court to look at.
 7
       I think it's appropriate to give and it comes out
 8
 9
       of the annotations of --
10
                       THE COURT: Where are you because
       I'm looking at it?
11
12
                      MR. BAILEY: Okay. I'm at the --
       Page 227 on the bottom left, the legislative
1:3
14
       intent.
15
                      THE COURT: Where -- okay. Right
16
       here. Okay.
17
                      MR. BAILEY: It says, "When the
       ordinary time permitting or the term repeatedly is
18
       applied to the statute, it is evident that the
19
20
       statue --
21
                      THE COURT:
                                  That is part -- more
22
       than once --
23
                      MR. BAILEY: More than once.
24
                      THE COURT: Which means repeatedly
25
       means more than once. Okay.
```

```
1
                        THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I would
        like for you to reconsider the harassment -- lesser
  2
  3
        sentence of harassment.
 · 4
                        THE COURT: I will take it under
        advisement in that regard because harasses is a
  5
        necessary element of this offense and harassment is
  6
        defined and it is applicable in this case. But,
  7
        again, I think that the evidence doesn't warrant
 . 8
        it, but I will look at it again.
  9
             And if you'll have him over here, just even
 10
        five till, I'll let you know.
11
12
             And, Mr. Bailey, if you have anything, you can
       maybe present to the Court your position on that.
1.3
       I think it would be -- well, I've said that.
14
1.5
                       MR. BAILEY: Your Honor, what time
16
       did you say to be back?
17
                       THE COURT: One o'clock.
18
                       (Lunch recess.)
19
                       (Court back in session.)
20
                      THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Minnifield,
       right at the break, you had asked the Court to
21
       reconsider giving a lesser included on harassment.
22
       Does the State have any further response?
23
24
                      MR. BAILEY: The State does, Your
       Honor. I have had an opportunity to look at the
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

law. I did some research and came across the -- I would say with all honesty to the Court that I tried to look at just about every stalking case that I could and could not find a situation where there was ever a requested lesser included charge or whether it was ever brought up on appeal.

But what I did come across was a case entitled Chambers v. City of Opelika. It went to the Court of Criminal Appeals. It's a 1997 case. It's cited in the Southern Reporter 698 7 2nd 792. And, basically, the facts of this case are the defendant was charged with a crime of menacing. And the defendant at the end of the case had requested a charge of harassment. And at that time, the Court denied his request to give a lesser included charge of harassment. And in that, the Court said that -and this is talking about the Court of Criminal Appeals. This Court has used the following litmus test to determine whether a crime was necessarily a lesser included offense of another, and they give this test where all the elements of an offense separate from the offense charged are present in or included among elements of the charged offense, such separate offense is a lesser included offense for which the defendant may be convicted though

acquitted of the offense charged.

1.3

1.8

To be necessarily included in the greater offense, the lesser must be such that it is impossible to commit the greater without having committed the lesser. And I think those -- that last sentence, probably the thing that I would ask the Court to zero in on. And I'll just say again, the lesser must be such that it is impossible to commit the greater without having first committed the lesser.

And if the Court would look at the elements of stalking, which 13A690 in the Code of Alabama, I think the Court would see that it is possible to be convicted of stalking without having first committed the crime of harassment. Stalking says a person who intentionally, repeatedly follows or harasses another person and who makes a credible threat, either expressed or implied, with the intent to place that person in reasonable fear of death or serious bodily harm.

I would also argue in conjunction with that, that harasses as defined in the code and section for stalking is similar but is distinguishable with the harassment that's defined in, I believe, 13A118 of the Code of Alabama.

```
1
                       THE COURT: Well, I've looked at
        that in particular, that portion of it, and it is a
  2
        different definition. And I have reconsidered, but
  3
        I'm not going to give the lesser included of
  4
  5
       harassment.
             And your objection is noted for the record,
  6
       Mr. Minnifield.
 8
                       THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 9
                       THE COURT: And I've given that,
       and, again, I overrule your objection.
10
            Do both of you feel like you can make your
11
12
       closing in about fifteen minutes?
13
                       MR. BAILEY: I can.
14
                       THE COURT: Because I may limit you
15
       if I think it's necessary.
16
                       (Brief recess taken.)
17
                       (In the presence of the jury.)
18
                      THE COURT: Okay. At this time,
       we'll be addressing closing arguments. And is the
19
20
       State --
21
                      MR. BAILEY:
                                  State is ready, Your
22
       Honor.
23
                      THE COURT:
                                  The State will address
       you first and then Mr. Minnifield and then the
24
       State has the right to have final close.
25
```

MR. BAILEY: Ladies and gentlemen, I want to begin by thanking you for your attention during the trial of this matter. I know it has not been an easy thing for you to do, and I know that none of you have volunteered to be here at the beginning of the week and sit in a trial. I know that you were directed to by getting a little piece of paper in the mail. But nevertheless, I appreciate your service. Your service as jurors is very important to the judicial system.

In the United States, we live under a constitution, a constitution which guarantees us certain freedoms and liberties. But we, also, in the United States, live under a code of laws. It's a code of laws which prohibits conduct. In the state of Alabama, these laws are enumerated in what we call the Code of Alabama. Contained within this code, there are many, many laws, which prohibit many different kinds of conduct. But more specifically, for the case at hand today, there is a law contained within this code which prohibits the crime of stalking.

And that's why we're here today, ladies and gentlemen. As I said to you in opening statement, we're here today because this man, John Minnifield,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

could not let this woman go, couldn't take the fact that she wanted to get out from under his control. And that's what the evidence throughout the course of this trial has shown you. And I just want to spend just a minute or two telling you, first, what I have to prove to you in this case.

As I told you in voir dire and also when I was questioning you when you were being selected for the jury and also in opening statement, my burden of proof throughout the course of this trial was beyond a reasonable doubt. It was not beyond all doubt. As I told you earlier in the trial, you. couldn't be convinced beyond all doubt unless you were a witness to the case, and that would therefore disqualify you serving as a juror.

What did I have to prove to you? Well, I had to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant committed the crime of stalking. Section 13A690 of the Code of Alabama defines stalking as a person who intentionally and repeatedly follows or harasses another person and who makes a credible That threat can be either expressed or implied with the intent to place that person in reasonable fear of death or serious bodily harm. don't have to intend that the person actually

intended to kill someone -- which I think the evidence in this case has shown -- but I do have to prove that he had the intent to place that person in reasonable fear of death or serious bodily harm.

So our elements to prove stalking is attempt, credible threat, and act of harassing or following. And the Judge will instruct you on the law at the end of this case. And in that instruction, she will tell you that in order to find the defendant guilty of stalking, all you have to find is that he did these things more than once -- more than one time. And I think the testimony that's been presented in this case is abundantly clear that the defendant did those things and did that on more than one occasion.

That was my burden of proof. My burden of proof was to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant, John Minnifield, did these things. I think through the testimony that was presented to you that once you go back and consider the evidence, look at the evidence that has been presented, you'll find the defendant guilty as charged. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Minnifield?

THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon,

2.

ladies and gentlemen. I'm sorry to keep y'all here so long, but sometimes you have to keep a person a little longer to prove a point. And this point is here. The State has not proven a point of stalking. You heard the witnesses. You see the motions here that you all have seen. These are not stalking motions. It's only disorderly conduct, just something that's in domestic violence of any person that come under the laws of domestic violent when two peoples has different opinion about things.

Vonciel Minnifield has the right to live and walk on this earth, feel free to go wherever she wants to. She has the right to marry whomever she want to. But when Vonciel Minnifield marry a person, it's no reason or no right for her to go out there and cheat on this person and play this man for a fool and think nothing is going to be said or did about it.

I will never, never hurt Vonciel Minnifield.

She is a lot younger than I am. Y'all might think

I'm obsessed with that, but I'm not. I didn't have

time to be obsessed with it. I had time to work

and take care of her children. I'm not the father.

I didn't claim to be. I was the stepfather that

11.

got those kids from the welfare, bought her a home, married her, and put them in that home. I worked from four in the morning sometime eleven and twelve o'clock at night, several different jobs, to keep bread on the table, clothes on all of them back.

You all heard what the kids said. I was their stepfather. I treated them like a child, like they were my own, because I love children. I love my wife, but I couldn't stand her cheating on me. And I'm taking care of business at home. I never cheated on my wife because I was satisfied to have a beautiful young wife. Today I'm sixty years old. She only thirty-five. I was a proud man, but now I'm a beaten man.

I'm not angry enough to go do anything to this lady. You've seen the witnesses come up here, and you heard what they said. A lot of the witness, it has been rehearsed what to say. You all heard that.

You all heard Mr. Ronnie Waters. He is the owner over the building she work at. Mr. Johnnie Sullivan is a partner. He don't be around her that much. They set up schedules over the phone.

Mr. Ronnie Waters sat up there and told you I was an employee there. I had a right to go there. My

job with Wilson and Price, I was there for eight years when I met her. I was a currier. My job carried me all over the state of Alabama. I made a good decent living.

But I was a lonely man until I met Vonciel.

From the first day I met Vonciel, the first night,

Vonciel moved in with me. She never, never

relinquished that role. She was there. She didn't

walk out of my house until October the 8th, the

house we shared together because she could not stay

put.

If I didn't trust my wife -- she had a vehicle I bought. I bought all the vehicles. She could use any one she wanted. She had keys to any of them. If I didn't trust her, then why would I buy her a vehicle? I paid for all of this so she can go and come, and I don't have to be there.

I was the mother and the father. In the morning time -- they call me the morning mother because I go to my job, check on what I had to do, and I come back home, and I'll wake those childrens up, get them ready for school, the three of them. I cook their breakfast. She's in there asleep.

Now, she said I drank. Sure, I drank. When I met her, I was drinking nothing but beer. As time

went on, pressure started getting to me, and I seen that Vonciel was looking over the horizon. She was looking at something different because she had never had a man to stand there and give her a home and treat her like a lady and set her up on a highest pedestal.

I did that, and I didn't do it forcely. I did it willingly. I couldn't go along with the drug use. I couldn't go along with the cheating. I'm a God fearing person. But I start drinking more and more because I couldn't see her walking away or being able to come around a corner and she in somebody's arm. That hurts. That hurts dearly.

When the other girl -- she's not here today -- when that girl had to have an operation, she went to Birmingham to the Children's Hospital.

\$MR.\$ BAILEY: Your Honor, could I object at this time?

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain your objection.

Mr. Minnifield, you can only discuss the evidence that's been presented. You cannot testify at this time.

And I would caution the jury, and I'll remind you that the arguments are not evidence and you can

. 9

7 7

1.2

1.3

only consider the evidence that was presented from the witness stand or as an exhibit.

So, Mr. Minnifield, you need to confine it to what the evidence was.

will show that these three has been into evidence. You all have looked at them, just a copy of them here. And either one of them is proof. This was on 10/30 of '90, 11/14 of '98 -- excuse me -- not '90, but '98. Two of them was on one day and one was on the other date. This evidence here was contaminated. And by this, this evidence being contaminated -- this happened on separate days -- but the State wants you to believe that this is a continued pattern, stalking, reckless endangerment, harassment. There was no continued pattern.

Vonciel said she had filed several of these in the past before October the 8th. Vonciel had never, never filed any charges on me for doing anything to her. So this throws stalking out because it had to be acts of stalking. It shows it's got to be a repeatedly act. Just because one time, does not constitute stalking. In the Code of Alabama, as he stated right there, it will tell you -- we want to make it as short as possible so

1.0

we all can go and rest. But it also tell you the offense of stalking is a continuing act. It has got to be more than one. Act is a-c-t. You put the "S" on it, and then it's more than one.

They want you all to believe that when I went to Auburn to talk to my wife that -- I didn't go to threaten my wife. But you heard the security guard say yesterday he was hired by the company and her to go protect her. I never showed up there before. I went there with hundred thousand peoples to talk to my wife. I did not walk up on her to startle her, which I could easily have walked up to her and did something to her if I wanted to.

You heard Mr. Waters say it, and he her boss, that he came across the ground when he was told that I was out there. He came across. He walked up to John Minnifield. I didn't try to run or retreat or walk away. But the State wants you to prove, and Vonciel here is trying to prove, that John Minnifield took off running and they gave foot chase. Why would Mr. Waters have to lie? He told you I still worked there at Montgomery Catering as of today. But for the last year, I can't work no way.

The evidence is, I got out of jail on a bail.

5.

Я

1.4

1.8

2.1

I went to the even program to see was anything -was I a angry man. The Court can verify that. I
went there sixteen session. I lacked one
session --

THE COURT: Now, again,

Mr. Minnifield, I'm going to caution you to just

comment on the evidence that was presented.

THE DEFENDANT: All right. And the evidence, I'm telling you, expressing to you all today, as you all go back there to deliberate, I want you to search your heart. I want you to look at John Minnifield. Do I look like an angry man, a desperate man, whom could not release control of that lady right there? I'm not like that. I would have been less than a man not to go and find out what was wrong. Why, baby, can't we make it? Two people separate. That's it. They try to get back together by all means except forcefully because the laws of the land do not let you force nothing or act upon another person.

I have did things in this case here constitute nothing no more than harassment. I admitted that I was wrong and under the influence of alcohol when I went over there and I kicked her door open because John Minnifield knew there was a man in there and

б

we were talking about going back together. And just that Friday alone, she asked me for communication, a telephone. I go get it for her. Everybody got the number but me. When I -- or should I be angry when it got changed on a Monday? Shouldn't I someway be able to contact her and those little girls there? I didn't have a phone. I had a beeper. She could page me with our code, and I would have been there for whatever to help or protect my wife and my kids.

I didn't call them my stepchildren. I called them my children. The boy, Jason, the oldest, he's not here now. He cared more about John Minnifield than his own father. But repeatedly, this boy, 17 -- this kid come up from here to up there where he at now. He be getting to love me. My wife seen that. He seen her at night --

MR. BAILEY: Judge, I'm going to object. I don't know who he's talking about, this person --

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection. Again, Mr. Minnifield -- and I'll remind you that you only have a few more minutes.

You can only comment on evidence that was presented in court.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. This evidence is. I won't be bringing that up.

You heard Nicholas Washington. He sat up

You heard Nicholas Washington. He sat up there and said I was going out of town. He didn't know whether I worked there or not because this has been rehearsed. You heard Karen Blanch, that stay next door to me -- excuse me. I'm a little off on my balance and stuff, but I'm not drinking -- but she stay next door to us, me and my wife. She was friends to the both of us.

July, I was released from the county on bail.

I live in Alex City --

THE COURT: Again, Mr. Minnifield, you can't comment on those matters.

THE DEFENDANT: You heard what she said, Ms. Blanch. She said -- and I quote -- This woman did come down to my house, followed me in, turned around, parked next door. I went to come out, and she had the street blocked. I might not called a restraining order not to go within a thousand yards of her. Then that works both ways --

THE COURT: Mr. Minnifield, again,

I'm going to caution you not to comment on things

that were not admitted into evidence. And you have

2.3

about three or four more minutes to complete your argument.

THE DEFENDANT: You heard Ashley and Dana Cook's statement. They wasn't afraid of me because they know I was their stepfather. You heard Pete Rose statement. He was an angry man because I caught him there. Clemmitha Petace, the sister. You heard what she said. It didn't say I was following Vonciel. It never came up and said that I was following her or stalking her.

Lawanda, you heard her statement. And her statement sitting right there, you know where she is. Even though I'm scared of you. Because she knew how much I loved this woman and those children because she was there a lot. She felt, and I felt, if I caught my wife cheating, I probably would do something to her. We never know until we cross that bridge, and it goes vice versa. Since more women on the jury than men, it goes vice versa, if you caught your spouse that way.

But, ladies and gentlemen, as you go back to deliberate, I want you to search your heart. You can send John Minnifield to prison today or you can come back with a lesser charge. The Judge will instruct you of that. But I cannot get in your

1	mind. I can only tell you what's in my heart. I
2	don't know either one of y'all, but if you all want
3	to send me to prison
4	THE COURT: And, Mr. Minnifield,
5	that's not proper argument. And it's something the
6	jury should not take into consideration, any
7	possible punishment.
8	THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Well, I'm
9	going to close this. And we, along with the State
10	and Vonciel, appreciate you all being here
11	listening to this. It never, never should have
12	gotten this far. Thank you.
13	MR. BAILEY: Just briefly, but may I
14	respond, Your Honor?
15	THE COURT: Yes.
16	MR. BAILEY: Ladies and gentlemen,
17	Mr. Minnifield has tried throughout the course of
18	this trial through his testimony, through his
19	questioning of witnesses, and through his argument,
20	tried to convince you, as citizens of this
21	community, that this is a normal relationship.
22	This is the way normal people behave and react in
23	these type situations.
24	Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you, and

the evidence has shown, that normal people do

25

2.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not -- who are in love with another person, do not threaten to kill that person, do not repeatedly follow and harass that person, do not repeatedly try to control that person's life.

Mr. Minnifield has made a statement on several occasions during the course of this trial of all the things that he's bought Vonciel, all the things that he's paid for for Vonciel and the children, as if all the money that he's thrown her way, she's his property. He can do what he wants to with her, and she's supposed to be at home behaving like she should and doing what he says.

Ladies and gentlemen, Vonciel Minnifield is a She's a human being. She has a right. she does not want John Minnifield near her, she doesn't want John Minnifield talking to her, she has a right to tell him not to, and she did. he didn't get the message, and that's what this case is all about. That's what this case is all about.

You heard the testimony, and I'm not going to go through all the testimony. But I do want to bring out some highlights of some of the things that were said during the course of this trial. First of all, let me tell you, the defendant said

in his opening statement, he promised you a lot of things that he did not deliver on, ladies and gentlemen. He promised he was going to bring in all of these witnesses that was going to prove John Minnifield was innocent. He promised you he was going to bring in all of these witnesses that were going to say that Vonciel Minnifield was having an affair that would somehow justify his actions, and he didn't.

And let me comment just one small amount on all these allegations about Vonciel Minnifield having an affair and cheating on John Minnifield.

Ladies and gentlemen, there was absolutely not one shred of evidence that that occurred. I considered putting Vonciel back up and letting her answer those allegations. I wanted to, but no. I didn't want to highlight his defense, highlight these lies, because that's all that they were. He didn't bring in anybody, ladies and gentlemen, that proved that.

But let's just say for just a second that that occurred. Let's buy his argument, not to highlight it or give it any credibility. Does that give him a right to do the things he did? Absolutely not. Why? Because it's against the law. It's against

2

.3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the laws of the State of Alabama to do the things that he did.

Witnesses that we had that came in and testified -- we had Tim Brown, who was her neighbor's son, that came in and testified about the time that John Minnifield ran them off the road. Rosebud Brown, who was a next-door neighbor, Tim Brown's mother, said that in October of '98 she saw Mr. Minnifield come into a rage and knock down Mrs. Minnifield's door. We had the children who came and testified mainly about the October incident. About one of her daughters -- I can't remember. I think it was Dana that was hit by John Minnifield. Both of the children testified that when John Minnifield crashed in the door with the hatchet, he started choking Vonciel. Is that the way a normal human being should be treated? Then chasing his family that he loves so dearly through the house with a hatchet, that's something out of a horror movie, ladies and gentlemen. That's not something that you would expect a decent citizen of this community to behave.

And then his testimony before you when he was testifying. Do You remember him sitting here and saying, Yeah, I was out to get her. That may send

1.3

1.8

2.1

2.4

me to the prison for the rest of my life -- that was his words -- but I was out to get her.

Ladies and gentlemen, over and over again,

Lester Glaxton, hired by whomever, whether it was

Mrs. Minnifield or the company, to come and

protect -- I think that was apparent from all the

testimony, Vonciel included -- that he was there to

protect this woman. Does a normal human being have

to hire someone to protect them from someone who's

supposed to love and care for them? Is that the

way someone should have to act? No. Why? Because

it's against the law to behave like he was

behaving.

Lawanda Benson, the babysitter, ladies and gentlemen, testified that the defendant came to her house on numerous occasions all times of the night. One night he came, he had a gun in his pants, made a threat, going to kill her. That's something that just about every witness that testified, with the exception of a few, heard this defendant threaten her life. Is that normal? I suggest not.

Nicholas Washington, dishwasher for RSA Plaza, tell Vonciel she's not going to live to see

Thanksgiving. I'm fixing to go out of town. Just tell her she better watch out. I'm not going to go

2.0

2.5

through all of the witnesses, but another probably very important witness for the State of Alabama -- the defendant has made an allegation that this is a big conspiracy against him, that all these witnesses have been rehearsed and come in here and told what to testify, I guess.

There's one important witness, G. L. Sisson, police officer with Montgomery Police Department. You say probably the most impartial witness throughout this whole proceeding. He didn't know either one of these parties. What did he testify about, ladies and gentlemen? He testified about going to those apartments that night. When he drives up, he sees this man right here chasing his wife around the parking lot with a hatchet making threats, "I'm going to kill you. If I get you, I'm going to kill you." And you remember the defendant when he was questioning G. L. Sisson, you know, making a big deal, "Well, are you sure you saw me chasing her around? Are you sure you saw me doing this and that?"

Ladies and gentlemen, he admits to it in his statement. And let me get to that, the defendant's statement. I could probably have made this case a lot simpler and a lot easier and a lot of time

saved --

THE DEFENDANT: I'm going to object to the statement, you can go back. It was never --

THE COURT: What is your objection?

THE DEFENDANT: My objection is he said that Mr. Sisson said I was chasing her with a hatchet, and I object.

THE COURT: Wait just a moment. I'm going to sustain your objection, but the jury has heard the evidence, and you can recollect what the evidence was or was not in that regard. Go ahead.

MR. BAILEY: In the defendant's own statement, I could have probably saved us a lot of time in this case and just admitted the defendant's statement. I mean, sure, it's a lot of self-serving stuff in this, ladies and gentlemen, but yet, there's a lot of stuff in this statement that the defendant admits to that's enough to convict him of the crime.

He admits to talking to Washington at RSA

Plaza, even though he does deny the threats. He

admits, ladies and gentlemen, going to Lawanda

Benson's house. He admits to going to Auburn

University. Ladies and gentlemen, he also admits

to tampering with Mrs. Minnifield's car.

1.5

Why does a person do that? Is that the way a person who loves and cares for someone acts? What do you have? All of these events have been testified about. What do you have? You have a pattern of following, and then you have a pattern of harassing. Why else would you go and tamper with someone else's car unless you were harassing?

And then you have Vonciel Minnifield, who testified about all the events that happened, the notes that were left on her car. Look at these, "Tonight, be at home. Now, the war is on, germ carrying pictures. Do not lie." Testified about him coming to her church. Testified about all the numerous threats that were placed on her life. She was constantly having to run from house to house trying to avoid this man.

Ladies and gentlemen, the point is, the reason that we have a stalking law across the country and especially in the state of Alabama in this case is so that women, particularly, do not have to keep running and fearing for their lives because of a man's ability to stop his own actions, to not control, not to let go. That's the whole reason that we have a law that prevents that type of behavior.

2.3

The defendant said in his closing argument, "I've done some things that constitute no more than harassment." He, not only admits, according to G. L. Sisson in front of the Judge, "If I would have gotten her that day, I would have used that hatchet on her." He says that in his statement as well. But he sits here in front of the jury that's considering his faith in this case and tells you, Yeah, I probably did some things that constituted harassment. Well, what is stalking, ladies and gentlemen? It's pattern of harassment. He sat here and told you that. I'm not going to belabor the point anymore, ladies and gentlemen.

When Mrs. Minnifield took those vows with Mr. Minnifield, they each promised to love and to hold and to cherish one another. Is that what happened? I think not. Mrs. Minnifield decided that she could not live in his house under his control, and she decided -- felt fearful and decided to get out, and she did. And he couldn't accept that. So he, for the last two years, has terrorized her life. She told you, made her fear of her life, her children's life. Is that any way for anybody to have to put up with?

You've heard the evidence, ladies and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

gentlemen. The Judge is going to instruct you on the evidence. And you have to follow the Judge's But one thing this Judge cannot take instructions. away from you, the one thing that I cannot take away from you, the one thing that John Minnifield cannot take away from you, the one thing the State of Alabama cannot take away from you when you go into that jury deliberation room is your God gift of common sense. You get to take that back there with you. And I want each and every one of you to use that God-given common sense and look at the testimony presented in this case. Look at the pattern presented in this case and ask yourselves, Did this man commit the crime of stalking? then after all the consideration of the evidence, I feel confident that you will come back and return a verdict of guilty.

And then I want to end with this. One of the very last things that the defendant said in his statement to the Montgomery Police Department,

Cassandra Williams. You -- "Question: You would lie to save your neck? Answer: Would I lie to save my neck? Question: Yes, sir. Answer by Mr. Minnifield: It all depends on the situation that I'm in." He's in a situation. What did he do?

1	Thank you.
2	THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, may we
3	approach the bench?
4	THE COURT: Okay.
.5	(Attorneys approach the bench.)
6	THE DEFENDANT: Would you consider
7	the lesser included case due to the fact
8	THE COURT: I've already ruled on
9	that, Mr. Minnifield.
10	MR. HARTLEY: Judge, he's pointing
11	out in his argument that this is a matter of series
12	of what makes stalking
13	THE COURT: I've made my decision,
14	and you can note that again at the end of the
15	trial.
16	(Attorneys return to their seat.)
17	THE COURT: It's now my duty to
18	explain to you the law that will guide you in your
1.9	deliberations and I apologize for my voice.
20	It's going and coming. I'm going to try to go very
21	slow because I will be covering quite a few legal
22	definitions. And, unfortunately, in the state of
23	Alabama, you're not permitted to have a copy of my
24	charge to take with you. I disagree with the law
25	in this respect and think you should, but I must

follow it and so must you.

Now, this case is brought to you by an indictment which charges John Minnifield with stalking. I want you to understand from the beginning that the indictment has no bearing whatsoever on the guilt or innocence of any person. It is not evidence in the case. It's merely the paperwork or legal process by which a case is presented for trial.

Now, as to this charge, the defendant has pled not guilty. A plea of not guilty places the burden on the State of Alabama to prove by the evidence presented the guilt of defendant beyond a reasonable doubt. So before a conviction can be had, each of you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt of his guilt. Otherwise, he's entitled to an acquittal.

Furthermore, the defendant is presumed to be innocent, and that presumption attends him until his guilt is established from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. This presumption of innocence is evidence in the case and is to be considered by you along with all the other evidence. It is a fact which is to be considered by you and goes with the defendant to your verdict unless the evidence

2.

convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of the proof of each and every element of the offense here.

Now, we've all mentioned reasonable doubt.

And it's a relative term, and it's not always easy to define. Basically, a reasonable doubt, it's a fair doubt. It's based upon reason and common sense and arising from the evidence. In short, it's a doubt for which you can assign a reason that comes from the evidence. A reasonable doubt may arise not only from the evidence produced, but also from a lack of evidence or any part of the evidence. Again, the burden is on the State to prove the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, the law tells us this about the term, "reasonable doubt." It's not just a mere possible doubt. In other words, it's not a mere guess, surmise, or capricious doubt.

Now, the doubt which would justify an acquittal must be an actual doubt. The reasonable doubt which would entitle an accused to an acquittal is not fanciful, vague, conjectural, or speculative, but is a reasonable doubt arising from the evidence and remaining after a careful consideration of the testimony, such as reasonable

2.

fair-minded and conscientious men and women such as you would consider under all the circumstances.

Now, the State is not required to convince you of defendant's guilt beyond all doubt or to a mathematical certainty. Again, it's simply beyond a reasonable doubt.

I told you earlier that you were the sole

judges of the evidence, and I'm going to explain to you or remind you what is and what is not evidence. First, as I just said, the indictment here, it is not evidence. In addition, the arguments, statements, or assertions of the attorneys or the parties during the course of the trial is not evidence. Rulings by the Court during the course of the trial, that is not evidence. Evidence is simply the testimony of witnesses under oath from the witness stand, any exhibits that were actually admitted, and any presumptions of law that I've given you such as the presumption of innocence.

Just as you're the judges of the evidence, you're also the sole and exclusive judges of the credibility of witnesses and the weight that should be given their testimony. In passing on the credibility of witnesses, you have the right to consider such things as any bias, interest, or

2.

2.2

prejudice that may have been exhibited to you while that person was testifying. You also can consider the demeanor of the witness on the stand; that is, how did they appear to you while they were testifying? You also can consider the basis for their testimony; that is, how did they know the facts to which they testified? Did they have an opportunity to see, hear, learn? Just how did they know those facts?

Finally, you may accept or reject any part of the testimony of a witness and may accept only the testimony you consider worthy of belief.

Now, the defendant in this case has testified in his own behalf, and he has a perfect right to do so. And you cannot capriciously disregard his testimony any more than that of any other witness. The law is that you must take his testimony in the case and consider it along with all the other testimony. But while you are considering his testimony, you may also take into consideration his interest in the outcome of the case.

Finally, I want to point out to you, at this time, that I am not permitted to express my opinion or to comment on the fact of the evidence or the credibility of any witness. Therefore, any

2.1

rulings, statement, or even expression that may have been made by me during the course of the trial is not to be considered by you as any effort on my part to convey to you any feeling or opinion about the facts in the case or the credibility of any witness.

Now, with regard to this particular charge, the defendant is charged with stalking. A person commits the crime of stalking if he intentionally and repeatedly follows or harasses another person and makes a credible threat, either expressed or implied, with the intent to place that person in reasonable fear of death or serious bodily harm.

Thus, in order to convict, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of these following elements: First of all, that the defendant, John Minnifield, followed or harassed Vonciel Minnifield; second, that he made a credible threat, either expressed or implied; third, that he did so repeatedly or more than once and that in so doing, he acted with intent to place Vonciel Minnifield in reasonable fear of death or serious bodily harm. Intent is defined under the law as when a person acts intentionally with respect to a result or to conduct when his purpose is to cause

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that result or to engage in that particular conduct. A credible threat is a threat expressed or implied made with the intent and the apparent ability to carry out the threat so as to cause the person who is the target to fear for her own safety or the safety of a family member and to cause reasonable, mental anxiety, anguish, or fear.

Harasses, as used here, is when one engages in an intentional course of conduct directed at a specified person which alarms or annoys that person or interferes with the freedom of movement of that person in which serves no legitimate purpose. course of conduct must be such as would cause a reasonable person to suffer substantial emotional distress and must actually cause substantial emotional distress.

A course of conduct, as used here, is a pattern of conduct composed of a series of acts over a period of time, which evidences a continuity of purpose. If you find from the evidence that the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt each of these elements of stalking, then you would find the defendant guilty as charged. On the other hand, if you find that the State has failed to prove one of -- one or more of the elements beyond a

reasonable doubt, you would find the defendant not guilty.

In a moment, you will be beginning your deliberations. In passing on the evidence, you have the right to use your knowledge of people and their affairs. This is the tool that is given you in which some of us simply call your common sense. In arriving at your verdict, you must not permit sympathy, emotion, or prejudice to influence you.

Furthermore, you must not base your verdict upon any preconceived idea of what would be a popular or unpopular verdict. In other words, your verdict must strictly be based on the evidence presented and the law that applies.

Also, before you reach a verdict, all twelve of you must reach the same verdict. In other words, it must be unanimous. It can't be a split verdict. In a moment, you'll be going back to the jury deliberation room, and one of the first things you need to do is to select one person to act as your foreperson or spokesperson. Now, that person will have no greater weight in your deliberations than anyone else, but will simply act as your spokesperson. You need to discuss the case, and if you have any questions, there's paper and pencil

5.

22.

back there. Have the foreperson write out the question, sign it. And if it's a question of law, I will answer it. However, if it's a question of fact, I cannot assist you, as you're the sole and exclusive judges of the facts.

Once you have reached a verdict, have the foreperson sign it, knock on the door -- and we'll let you know. There are two doors. There's one here and one back there. There are also restrooms -- and you'll be brought back into the courtroom, and the verdict will be read in the court.

I've prepared a verdict form, and it will go back with you as well as the exhibits that were actually admitted. It's a very simple verdict form. You have a choice of either we, the jury, find the defendant guilty of stalking as charged in the indictment or we, the jury, find the defendant not guilty.

In a moment, I'm going to have the court reporter take you back to the jury deliberation room.

But let me ask if the -- either side has any objections other than what you've already noted as your objection, Mr. Minnifield, to the Court's

```
charge? Do you have anything in addition?
1
                      THE DEFENDANT: Nothing other than
2
      the motion.
3
                      THE COURT: And we'll discuss that
4
      in just a moment.
5
                      MR. BAILEY: The State of Alabama is
6
       satisfied.
7
                      THE COURT: I'm going to get you to
 8
       take them back there -- and if you want to take a
9
       break, for instance, if you want to go get cokes or
1.0
       something, we can let you go down and do that. So
11
       that may be something else you want to discuss.
1.2
       Your time -- you are in charge of your time now.
13
       I'm not any longer. So it's what you want to do
14
       with regard to that. Okay.
15
                      (Out of the presence of the jury.)
16
                      THE COURT: For the record,
17
       Mr. Minnifield, you said you were satisfied with
18
       the Court's charge except in the regard -- I think
19
       you want to renew your motion about not giving the
20 -
       lesser included harassment?
21
                     THE DEFENDANT: Right.
22
                      THE COURT: Okay. And that is noted
23
       for the record. And I'm going to overrule your
24
       objection, and your exception is noted on the
25
```

record.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

(In the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Okay. I have your

questions, and I hope I can help you out. The first one is: Was there a restraining order mentioned in any testimony? Was any length mentioned, and if so, how long was it in affect?

The Court cannot comment on what evidence was produced or not produced. But I -- it's up to you to recollect the testimony. I will remind you that evidence is only sworn evidence from the witness stand and any exhibits. Anything said in closing argument is not evidence.

Now, with regard to can you get a transcript, just as I told you, you're not permitted to have a copy of my charge. In Alabama, there's no provision for the jury to have a transcript.

However, if there is a particular witness or a particular part of someone's testimony that you want the court reporter to read back, she can do that. She needs -- sometimes it takes a few minutes to get that together. But if there is a particular witness's testimony that you want read back or a portion of anyone's testimony that you

```
want read back, we can do that.
1
           So why don't y'all go back there and see if
2
      you -- and if you do want someone's testimony,
3
      bring that out, and it will still take a few
4
      minutes for her to get that together.
5
                      (Out of the presence of the jury.)
6
                      THE COURT: What says the State?
7
                      MR. BAILEY: Satisfied.
8
                      THE COURT: What says the defendant?
9
                      THE DEFENDANT: Satisfied.
10
                      (In the presence of the jury.)
11
                      THE JUROR: Ma'am, can I ask a
12
       question?
13
                      THE COURT:
                                  Sure.
14
                      THE JUROR: One of the jurors need
15
       to leave at five --
16
                      THE COURT: We'll be sure that the
17
      juror does.
18
                       THE JUROR: Okay. Thank you.
19
                      THE COURT: Let me and it may be --
20
       and one thing y'all may need to decide is when to
21
       come back. It's up to you in the morning. It's
22
       not -- five will be here soon.
23
            Let me ask one thing -- and are you the
24
       foreperson?
25
```

THE JUROR: Yes, ma'am. 1 THE COURT: You can just stay where 2. you are. You asked can we hear David Johnson's 3 testimony again. Let me ask this. There was reference during the course of the trial to David 5 Johnson, Mr. Minnifield's friend, is that who you 6 have in mind? 7 THE JUROR: We don't know who's who. 8 We don't know if he testified. 9 THE COURT: He did not testify, a 10 David Johnson. 11 THE JUROR: Was there another David 12 that you gave us testimony from? 13 THE JUROR: Is he the boss of 14 Mr. Minnifield? 15 THE COURT: Wait just a minute. 16 Okay. Now, I did -- there was a Don Thomason that 17 I gave you, and I'll read to you again the 18 stipulation. Okay. 19 The parties stipulated that if Don Thomason 2 0 was here, this would be his testimony, and you're 21 to consider it as any other testimony and as if he 2.2 had been here as a witness under oath. Don 2.3 Thomason was John Minnifield's employer. And in 24 mid October of 198 -- '98, after Mr. Minnifield was

25

```
arrested on a reckless endangerment charge,
1
      Mr. Minnifield told Mr. Thomason that if
2
       Vonciel Minnifield would have divorce papers drawn
3
       up, he would sign the divorce papers and
       Mr. Thomason agreed that he would notarize them.
5
       That was the stipulation. Is that what --
6
                      (Jurors nod.)
 7
                      THE COURT: I don't know how long
       it's going to take to read this and -- but she's
 9
       going to now read back to you. And if it's close
10
       to five, we may just have to stop. And this is the
11
       testimony, and it's Lawanda Benson.
1.2
                      (Court reporter reads back.)
13
                      THE COURT: Let me interrupt.
14
       this the testimony you wanted, because there was
15
       some confusion of names?
16
                      (Jurors nod.)
17
                      THE COURT: Go ahead.
18
                      (Court reporter continues to read
19
                      back.)
20
                      THE COURT: Okay. What time do
21
       y'all want to come back in the morning?
22
                      THE JUROR: Is nine o'clock okay?
23
                      THE COURT: Nine o'clock. We'll get
24
       you in the jury assembly room and bring you back
25
```

1.2

here because we'll being doing some things. If you have any notes, if you will leave them, we'll pick them up. The court reporter will keep them and hand them back out tomorrow morning. No one will look at them. I'm going to caution you, again, not to discuss the case, and we'll see you in the morning. We'll try to have some coffee.

(Out of the presence of the jury.)

(In the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Good morning.

Yesterday, we had finished -- or the court reporter reading back to you the testimony. But you had another question about do all of the elements of stalking have to be present at each incident? I'm going to go back over with you the elements of stalking and give you a little further explanation that I hope will be helpful.

Now, with regard to stalking, the State must prove three elements. First of all, that the defendant, John Minnifield, intentionally and repeatedly followed or harassed Vonciel Minnifield. The State must also prove beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant made a credible threat, either expressed or implied. And finally, the State must also prove that the defendant intended to place the

. 3

victim in reasonable fear of death or serious bodily harm.

Now, I'm going to go back to each of them and give you a little fuller definition. With regard to the first one, that the defendant -- the State must show that the defendant intentionally and repeatedly followed or harassed Mrs. Minnifield. Repeatedly means on more than one occasion. So under this element, the State must show that the accused either followed the victim on more than one occasion and/or that the accused harassed the victim on more than one occasion.

Now, follows is really self-explanatory, and it has its ordinary meaning.

With regard to harassment, under this statute, the State must prove that the accused engaged in an intentional course of conduct directed at Vonciel Minnifield, and that such conduct alarmed or annoyed her or interfered with her freedom of movement and such conduct by the defendant served no legitimate purpose, that such course of conduct would cause a reasonable person to suffer substantial emotional distress, and it must actually cause substantial emotional distress.

Now, course of conduct is used here as a

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

pattern of conduct composed of a series of acts over a period of time which evidences a continuity of purpose.

Now, with regard to the second element, that the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant made a credible threat, either expressed or implied. A threat is credible if it is made with the intent to cause the victim to fear for her safety or the safety of a family member and it does cause the victim to fear for her safety or the member of a family, and that it causes reasonable mental anxiety, anguish, or fear and that the accused had the apparent ability to carry out the threat. In this regard in determining whether a threat occurred, the entire factual context, including all of the surrounding events and reactions, must be considered. In other words, the totality of all the circumstances rather than just isolated incidents must be considered.

Furthermore, in order to constitute a credible threat, it is not necessary for the State to prove that the defendant had the actual intent to carry out the threat. It is enough if the threat causes the victim reasonably to fear for her safety or the safety of her family, and that the accused made the

threat with intent to cause the victim to feel such fear.

Finally, the State must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant intended to place the victim in reasonable fear of death or serious bodily harm. Again, a person acts intentionally under the law with respect to a result or to a conduct when his purpose is to cause that result or to engage in that particular conduct.

The question of intent is hardly capable of direct proof, and whether or not the defendant intended to cause the victim here,

Vonciel Minnifield, to feel fear is a jury question for you to decide. It's also a question for you to decide whether or not the defendant followed and/or harassed the victim on more than one occasion.

That's also a jury question for you to decide. And it's also a question for you to decide whether or not there was a credible threat.

If you find from the evidence that the State has proved the elements of stalking, that is that the defendant either followed and/or harassed the victim on more than one occasion and that there was a credible threat and that the defendant intended

to place the victim in reasonable fear of death or 1 serious bodily harm, if you find that the State has 2 proved all of those elements beyond a reasonable 3 doubt, you would find the defendant guilty as 4 charged. However, if you find that the State has 5 failed to prove one or more of those elements, you will find the defendant not guilty. 7 Does that help you? 8 (Jurors nod.) . 9 THE COURT: If you want something 10 else read back, it does take us a few minutes to 11 get that, but -- or if you have any other 12 questions, I think you know by now what to do. So 13 I'm going to let you go back there. 14 What says the State and the defendant? 15 MR. BAILEY: State of Alabama 16 17 satisfied. THE DEFENDANT: Satisfied. 18 THE COURT: Y'all know the way now, 19 so I'm going to let you go back there. 20 (Out of the presence of the jury.) 21 (In the presence of the jury.) 22 23 THE COURT: Okay. You had asked, and at this time, the court reporter is going to 24 read back the testimony of Mrs. Minnifield. Now, I 25

1	had excused both Mr. Bailey and Mr. Hartley. They
2	are in other courtrooms tending to other matters.
3	And Ms. Childs is going to be here on behalf of the
4 .	State. And, of course, Mr. Minnifield is here, so
5	they may be in and out. Okay.
6	MR. HARTLEY: Thank you, Judge.
7	MR. BAILEY: Thank you, Judge.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	(Court reporter read back.)
1.0	THE COURT: I think that's does
11	that help? And I think you know by now that if you
12	need to know anything, just ask, and we'll try to
13	help you out.
14	(Out of the presence of the jury.)
15	THE COURT: I realize this is a
16	serious matter, but this jury has worked very hard,
17	so don't have any comments while they're here.
18	Would you get them?
19	(In the presence of the jury.)
20	THE COURT: I understand you've
21	reached a verdict. And do you want to read the
22	verdict or do you want the Court to read the
23	verdict?
24	THE JUROR: You can read it.
25	THE COURT: Okay. It is the verdict

1.5

2.2

of the jury, we, the jury, find the defendant guilty of stalking as charged in the indictment.

Mr. Minnifield, you have the right to have the jury polled, which will mean that I ask each juror if this is their verdict. Do you want them polled?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And I'm going to ask each of you.

(Jury polled.)

THE COURT: And in accordance with the jury verdict, the Court will adjudicate the defendant guilty as charged. I know it's been a long few days, but I do just want to make a couple of comments because I don't know when I have seen a jury more dedicated to their duty.

I know this was a difficult decision, and you obviously took it very seriously and talked through the process, and we certainly appreciate how much you took this into consideration. I hope you've had a good experience. I know it's a hard decision, and it can be difficult being a jury -- juror.

The good news is that you are excused for the rest of the week. And it's certainly small compensation for what you've been doing, but you

```
can go down and get your juror fees. And, again,
1
      thank you for serving.
2
                      MR. BAILEY: Judge, could I say one
3
       thing?
4
                      THE COURT: Yes.
5
                      MR. BAILEY: If any of you would
6
       like to talk with me, I'll be down on the first
7
       floor in just a few minutes. You certainly don't
8
      have to, but I know a lot of you might have some
9
      questions or something.
10
                      THE COURT: At this time, it's up to
11
       you whether you want to talk with anyone and -- so
12
       that's strictly up to you. Okay.
13
                      (Out of the presence of the jury.)
14
                      THE COURT: Mr. Minnifield, I'm
15
       going to set sentencing -- and I will have
16
       Mr. Hartley stand in with you as well -- and I'm
17
       going to set sentencing for February 7th at eight
18
       o'clock. And someone from the probation office
19
       will be to talk with you about a presentence
20
21
       report.
                      THE DEFENDANT: It wouldn't be
22
       necessary. I would like to give oral notice of
23
       appeal.
24
                      THE COURT: Well, you cannot appeal
25
```

```
until after you're sentenced, and I can't sentence
 1.
       until after I get that report. And if we get it
 2
       before then, I'll put your case down as quickly as
 3
       possible.
                      THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
 5
                      THE COURT: Okay.
 6
 7
 8.
 9
                      THE COURT: John Minnifield.
10
            Mr. Hartley, I know you're not technically his
11
       attorney, but maybe you could just stand up here?
.12
                      MR. HARTLEY: Okay.
13
                      THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Minnifield,
14
       you're here today for sentencing. And, of course,
15
       you had waived your right to an attorney during the
16
       course of the trial. I have asked Mr. Hartley if
17
       he would stand up here with you for sentencing. Is
18
       there anything you want to tell the Court before I
19
       pronounce sentence?
20
                       THE DEFENDANT: Can I say it after
21
22
       the sentencing?
                       THE COURT: Well, no. You need to
23
       say it before the sentencing.
24
                       THE DEFENDANT: Well, this Court is
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
aware -- they are very well aware that I am not
guilty of the case of stalking. I will not bow
down on my knees for something I didn't do. I
was -- illegal evidence was used in this case.
               THE COURT: Well, you can, you
know -- you had already indicated before sentencing
you were going to appeal, and you certainly can
raise such matters on appeal. But a jury heard the
evidence, and the Court did also, and the jury
found you guilty as charged.
               MR. HARTLEY: Judge, there's one
issue. Can I tell her about that report,
Mr. Minnifield?
               THE DEFENDANT: It's up to you.
               MR. HARTLEY: Judge, quite
interestingly, I think Ms. McCarty was the first
person to tell me about it. Apparently, last week
about the time you interviewed Mr. Minnifield, it
```

interestingly, I think Ms. McCarty was the first person to tell me about it. Apparently, last week about the time you interviewed Mr. Minnifield, it seems as though Dr. Carl Kirkland must have gone up and seen him in regard to an issue involving Social Security. And I would believe, then, that Dr. Kirkland probably generated a report, and I would think that the Court might benefit from seeing --

THE COURT: At whose request?

1	MR. HARTLEY: I think it's got
2	something to do with Social Security.
3	THE COURT: Well, I don't know that
4	he will be eligible.
5	MR. HARTLEY: But there may be
6	matters in that report that might be significant
7	that
8	THE COURT: I'm just concerned that
9	I did not think that they initiated that type thing
10	on their own.
11	MR. HARTLEY: I asked Mr. Minnifield
12	on it, and he said he saw Dr. Kirkland because of
13	Social Security matters, right?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Right. I had went
15	to Mental Health when I was out. And then Social
16	Security, they sent this man to see me. Evidently,
17	they didn't use mental health thing, you know
18	THE COURT: Well, certainly, I would
19	consider that. When did you talk to him?
20	THE DEFENDANT: What day that you
21	came to see me?
22	THE COURT: Well, it's been recent.
23	MS. MCCARTY: Last week.
2 4	MR. HARTLEY: Middle of the week.
2 5	THE COURT: Well, you're here today,

and I will certainly give him the benefit of 1 looking at the report. 2 If -- anyone here, if you want me to hear from 3 them today, or have them come back, that's up to 4 vou, but --5 MR. BAILEY: Would the Court 6 consider going ahead and sentencing him, and if 7 something does come up, you can hear a motion to 8 reconsider based on that? 9 THE COURT: Well, the only problem 10 is if I don't get -- sometimes they're behind on 11 the reports, and I -- I think there would be a way 12 though that I could reserve jurisdiction. So I'll 13 go ahead, and I may do that since everyone is here. 14 Is there anything --15 MR. BAILEY: Yes, Your Honor. 16 State's here present with Ms. Vonciel Minnifield, 17 the victim in the case, and also her counsel with 18 the Family Sunshine Center, Lashanda Seals, and 19 Mrs. Minnifield's children are both present in the 20 courtroom. And I believe Mrs. Minnifield would 21 like to address the Court at this time. 22 THE VICTIM: Do I need to read this? 23 No. You just need to THE COURT: 24

tell me whatever. Of course, I was present during

25

```
the trial and heard the evidence.
 1
                      THE VICTIM: Your Honor, basically,
 2
       T don't want anything bad to happen to anyone,
 3
       first of all, myself and my children, and my
 4
       husband, John. However, several preservation is
 5
       something that we're all born with. And my
 6
       children looked to me and to God for safety. And
 7
       right now I'm just looking for the Court for safety
 8
       because I do fear for my life.
 9
                      MR. BAILEY: Judge, I think -- does
10
       one of your children want to speak?
11
                      THE VICTIM: Both.
12
                      MR. BAILEY: Okay. Would y'all come
13
       on up?
14
                      MR. BAILEY: Just have one at a
15
       time.
16
                      MR. BAILEY: Okay. One at a time.
17
       Whichever is fine.
18
            If you could, state for the record your name.
19
                      DAUGHTER: Ashley Cook.
20
                      MR. BAILEY: You need to speak up.
21
       Okay.
22
                      DAUGHTER: Ashley Eliza Cook.
23
                      MR. BAILEY: And could you tell the
24
       Judge what you want to say?
25
```

1.1

DAUGHTER: I just want to say that I don't want anything bad to happen either. But I just want to live like everybody else, and I know if he gets out, he might kill us.

MR. BAILEY: Okay. If you could, please state your name for the record.

DAUGHTER: Dana Cook.

MR. BAILEY: Tell the Judge what you would like to say.

DAUGHTER: Like my mama and my sister, I don't want anything bad to happen. It's not that I fear for myself, just my mom and my sister because I see what they're going through. But I know if he gets out, something else is going to happen. So I'm just fearing for my mom and my sister right now.

MR. BAILEY: Judge, the State would add along with that, I've been prosecuting these crimes for three or four years now, and this is probably one of the more serious crimes that I have seen. The repeated threats for Mrs. Minnifield's life, threats that were made in front of judges, threats that were made in front of law enforcement officials, and even in his own statement, him saying that if he had caught her on that particular

```
day with that ax, he would have used it on her.
1.
      just think that type of evidence cannot be ignored.
2
            And we would also, at the proper time, be
3
       moving to invoke the habitual offender act.
4
      According to the defendant's NCIC, he does have
5
      thirty-three prior felonies. Unfortunately,
 6
      because they're spread out all over the place, we
 7
      were only able to get eleven of those priors as far
 8
       as certified, and we have those here today.
 9
                      THE COURT: One of my concerns is
10
       in, you know, sometimes it can be at least a month
11
       before I get a report, and I don't know that I
12
       would have jurisdiction over the matter after
13
       thirty days to -- if I needed to take that --
14
                      MR. HARTLEY: Judge, I think we
15
       could probably contact Dr. Kirkland and ask him to
1.6
       prioritize that one, and it might get here in a
17
       short time frame, because I imagine they could,
18
       since they've already had a week on it.
19
                      MR. BAILEY: For that matter, we
20
       could have Dr. Kirkland come in if he --
21
                      MR. HARTLEY:
                                    In fact --
22
                      MR. BAILEY: -- if worse came to
23
       worse.
24
                       THE COURT: He does have quite a
25
```

number -- do you have your certified priors?

7.

1.7

MR. BAILEY: Yes, Your Honor.

of them were in 1981 or before. They're certainly -- there haven't been any recent in almost twenty years. And I'm certainly going to take that into consideration. It really may be helpful to me to have -- but I don't know that that assessment for Social Security -- if it's going to enlighten the Court. And, you know, if he's incarcerated, I don't think he'll be eligible to receive Social Security.

MR. HARTLEY: Of course, Judge, I'm not -- that's not my worry, whether he gets Social Security. I just hope that the Court would have as much information as possible about his possible mental state or mental condition.

THE COURT: Well, as -- you know, during the trial, of course, the Court went over a number of things and found he was competent to represent himself. He certainly -- and I will say he, during the course of the trial, certainly was able to do that. And I don't want everyone to come back. I'm thinking if I did a split, at least I could reserve jurisdiction and then reconsider.

```
That was --
1
                      MR. HARTLEY: Sounds reasonable.
2
                      THE COURT: I -- it may be a
3
       situation where I determine that the split portion
       may not be appropriate.
5
                      MR. BAILEY: Judge --
                      THE COURT: I'm going to -- what?
 7
                      MR. BAILEY: I was just going to
 8
       suggest that maybe if I could -- or one of us could
9
       go back and call Dr. Kirkland.
10
                      THE COURT: Why don't you do that?
11
       I would like to have at least some time period
12
       because I don't want to lose jurisdiction. That is
13
       my main concern right now.
14
                      MR. BAILEY: I'll do that right now.
15
                      THE COURT: Okay. I'll get back
16
       with him in just a moment.
17
                      (Brief recess was taken.)
1.8
                      (Court back in session.)
19
                      THE COURT: John Minnifield. Okay.
20
       Mr. Minnifield -- Mr. Bailey, you were going to
21
       contact Dr. Refro's office?
22
                      MR. BAILEY: And I did, Your Honor.
23
       And speaking with his secretary, she said that the
24
       report would be ready probably about the first of
25
```

next week. She left me with the impression that there would have to be some type of order by the Court for them to turn it over because it was ordered by the Social Security Administration. But anyway, she went on to explain what this was -- that was done to Mr. Minnifield. She said that this was just a history that was done on him. There was no evaluation except an intelligence test was done, and the evaluation was basically to determine if he had any disabilities. She said this would have no relevance for this court case. And the big difference was this was not a forensic evaluation as the court typically orders.

THE COURT: I would -- I think,

THE COURT: I would -- I think,
though, since it's been raised, it would be a good
idea to have it in the record. And let's get a
copy of it for the record, but I think I can go
ahead and sentence.

Now, is there anything else anyone wants to tell the Court?

MR. BAILEY: I don't think we have anything else to say. Just in case I didn't do that, we would invoke the habitual offender act based on --

THE COURT: And I think it was

eleven?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BAILEY: We do have eleven certifieds there, Your Honor.

MR. HARTLEY: Your Honor, in regard to this matter, I really was in trial sort of to advise Mr. Minnifield and not being lead counsel, but I did note that he made an interesting point throughout the testimony that a great deal of what happened and what he did or what he said were in the course of involving a divorce case. And, for instance, if you take into as an example the trip, I think, that was to Auburn, some portion of the testimony involved that as being some significant part of this whole series of events. If vou take -- look over what was said, there was no threat there. There was no problem. It was just a matter of he was trying to get in touch with his wife to find out what was going to happen in regard to whether they were going to divorce or not divorce. And I think that the Court looks back over that and takes into account the fact that these people were married. They had matters they had to resolve. They had issues that were between them. Beyond the fact that this case just emphasizes the altercation that they had in

```
October, a lot of it would be justified if they
1
       were just in the process of getting a divorce.
 2
                      THE COURT: Well, there were a
3
       number of incidents testified during the trial and,
 4
       of course, as I said, the jury heard the evidence
 5
       and did find him guilty. I am taking into
 6
       consideration, however, that -- all of these
 7
       sentences of conviction were approximately twenty
 8
       years ago. But this is also a serious matter, and
 9
       I can't ignore that.
10
            With regard to this case, I'm going to
11
       sentence him to twenty years. And, of course, I
12
       would recommend that he undergo some type of
13
       substance abuse program and some type of anger
14
       management. At any time upon release, he's to have
15
       no contact with the victim or the family.
16
            What about restitution?
17
                      MR. BAILEY: There's restitution in
18
       the amount of four thousand three hundred and
19
       seventy-eight dollars.
20
                      THE COURT:
                                  Three hundred
21
       seventy-eight?
22
                      MR. BAILEY: Yes, Your Honor.
23
                      THE COURT: I'm not going to impose
24
```

a fine because, hopefully, at some point, she'll

25

get the restitution, but that will be mighty slow 1 coming in. Fifty dollars to the Crime Victim 2 Compensation, court costs. And, although, 3 Mr. Hartley did not represent you during the trial, 4 he was an attorney of record up until that time, 5 and I think it would also be appropriate to assess 6 attorney fees because he certainly had in more than 7 a hundred-fifty dollars' worth of time in the case. Order one half of any monies earned paid toward 9 your court-ordered monies. 10 You do have a right to appeal. If you cannot 11 afford a transcript or an attorney, that can be 12 provided for you. In addition, you will be given 13 credit for any time actually served as allowed by 14 law. Okay. I think that takes care of it. 15 THE DEFENDANT: I want to give oral 1.6 notice now of appeal and new trial. 17 THE COURT: I will note that you 18 have given oral notice of appeal. Let me ask this, 19 Mr. Minnifield. Do you want the Court to appoint 20 you an attorney to represent --21 THE DEFENDANT: No. 22 represent myself. 23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, again, I made

determinations that you are competent and capable

1	of representing yourself in trial. However, for
2	appellant purposes, there's also technical matters.
3	And if you do not comply with the Rules of
4	Appellant Procedure, your appeal could be
5	dismissed. There are serious consequences. And it
6	may be helpful to have an attorney to be sure you
7	don't have any problems in that regard.
8	THE DEFENDANT: It is going to be
9	problem wherefore John Minnifield name appear
10	because of the lies and stuff that has been told,
11	and it doesn't matter no more with me. That woman
12	know
13	THE COURT: Well, I'm going to go
14	ahead and appoint an attorney, and then you can
15	file something.
16	THE DEFENDANT: She know
17	THE COURT: That's all.
18	THE DEFENDANT: And they know that
19	I'm not going to bother them.
2 0	THE COURT: Okay. That's all.
21	THE DEFENDANT: And I want a motion
22	for a new trial too.
23	* * * * * * * * *
24	END OF PROCEEDINGS
25	* * * * * * * *

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 1 STATE OF ALABAMA 2 TALLAPOOSA COUNTY 3 I, Meridith Newman, Court Reporter and 4 Commissioner for the State of Alabama at Large, 5 hereby certify that on Monday, January 10 and 6 February 7, 2000, I reported the TESTIMONY AND 7 PROCEEDINGS in the matter of the foregoing cause, 8 and that the foregoing pages contain a true and , 9 accurate transcription of said proceedings. 10 I further certify that I am neither of kin nor 11 of counsel to any of the parties to said cause, nor 12 in any manner interested in the results thereof. 13 This 10th day of January, 2000. 14 This 7th day of February, 2000. 15 16 Micriath newman Meridith Newman, Court Reporter 17 Commissioner for the State of Alabama at Large 18 MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 12/30/2001 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

RR-1

1 4 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 2 OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, ALABAMA 3 STATE OF ALABAMA 4 · Plaintiff, 5 VS. X CC-99-327-SMG б JOHN MINNIFIELD. 7 Defendant. 8 9 10 MOTIONS HEARING 11 PROCEEDINGS 12 The above cause came on to be heard before 13 the Hon. Sally M. Greenhaw, Circuit Judge for the 15th Judicial Circuit of Alabama at the Montgomery 14 15 County Courthouse, Montgomery, Alabama; commencing 16 on March 6, 2000. 17 18 APPEARANCES 19 FOR THE STATE: 20 No appearance. 21 FOR THE DEFENDANT: 22 Pro Se. 23 24 COURT REPORTER FOR THESE PROCEEDINGS: DUB HARRIS 25

RR-1

4 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT 1 OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, ALABAMA 3 STATE OF ALABAMA Plaintiff, 4 VS. X = CC - 99 - 327 - SMG5 6 JOHN MINNIFIELD, Defendant. 7 8 9 1.0 MOTIONS HEARING 11 PROCEEDINGS The above cause came on to be heard before 12 the Hon. Sally M. Greenhaw, Circuit Judge for the 13 15th Judicial Circuit of Alabama at the Montgomery 14 15 County Courthouse, Montgomery, Alabama; commencing on March 6, 2000. 16 17 18 APPEARANCES 19 FOR THE STATE: 20 No appearance. 21 FOR THE DEFENDANT: 22 Pro Se. 23 24 COURT REPORTER FOR THESE PROCEEDINGS: DUB HARRIS 25

an attorney on appeal.

PROCEEDINGS

BY THE COURT: All right, Mr.

Minnifield, during the trial you waived your

attorney. Although I had Mr. Hartley sit

there, you did not indicate that you needed his

services during the trial. I've appointed you

Now, on these motions for new trial, you filed them Pro Se, and I've looked at your motion for a new trial, and also a motion for -- I guess a jury mistrial, and to reconsider the sentence, and I've read all your motions.

Now, one thing I need to make clear, I've appointed Mr. Burkhart to represent you on appeal. If for some reason you don t want him to represent you, you Il have to take that up with the appellate court, not me; do you understand that?

BY THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

BY THE COURT: Now, is there anything you have to say that you haven t already said in your written motions, because I've read over them.

BY THE DEFENDANT: I just feel, though, that everything in those motions, that I'm

1 entitled to.

BY THE COURT: It certainly sets out, you know, quite a few factors that happened during the trial, but the Court was there during the trial, and again I'll say for the record, you certainly were well able to represent yourself, and I m going to go ahead and deny these motions for new trial, and your other motions. So, now, everything can be taken up on appeal. So, I'm going to deny these motions, and they'll be part of the record as well.

BY THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

BY THE COURT: All right, thank you.

(Court adjourned)

* *

б

1.5

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ALABAMA
MONTGOMERY COUNTY

I, Dub Harris, Special Roving Court

Reporter and Registered Profesional Reporter of the

15th Judicial Circuit for the State of Alabama,

Montgomery, Alabama, do hereby certify as follows:

THAT I reported in shorthand the foregoing proceedings in the foregoing styled cause at the time and place stated heretofore;

THAT I later reduced my shorthand notes to computer-aided transcription, and the foregoing pages contain a full, true and correct transcript of the proceedings and testimony as herein set out;

THAT I am neither of kin nor of counsel to the parties to said cause, nor in any manner interested in the results thereof.

DONE this 8th day of March, 2000.

Dub Harris, Reporter.